



Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

May 4, 2006

1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Legislative Services Building

200 E. 14th Ave.

Audit Hearing Room, 1st Floor

Denver, CO

I. Call to Order: 1:34 p.m. Vice Chairman Arrowsmith

A. Roll Call

Arrowsmith, Cooke, Dennis, Feingold, Jenik, Sen. May, Picanso, Williams, T.

Excused: Rep. Cadman, Marroney, Sobanet, Wells

Quorum established.

B. Introduction of Audience

C. Approval of April 6, 2006 Meeting Minutes of the SIPA Board of Directors

The April 6, 2006 Meeting Minutes were approved with no objections.

II. Executive Director Appointment

MOTION: to permanently appoint Gregg Rippy to serve as the executive director of the Statewide Internet Portal Authority.

Cooke/ Feingold

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

III. Committee Reports

A. Business Committee, Michael Cooke

Michael Cooke reported that the Business Committee was charged with taking a look at some of the eRecording issues raised after the presentation at the April Board meeting. She reported that the committee met and had a great discussion with Carole Murray, Douglas County Clerk and Recorder. Michael Cooke stated that she had two items to report. First, House Bill 1242 was passed and signed, which extends the one-dollar fee received until June 2012. There was discussion surrounding using a portion of that fee for migrating eRecording to the portal.

The question that arose was how the fund would be managed, either through SIPA or the Secretary of State's office. The solution would probably be debated during the next legislative session, as it is too late for the current session. The committee found a model to work on over the summer months and turn into a bill. In the meantime, Douglas and Denver Counties will be working on an EGE Agreement so that they can come online with eRecording through the portal. Those counties will essentially serve as a "pilot" for the project. Since counties can use the dollar collected for eRecording, they plan to look at the portal as their solution and use a portion of the fees they collect to move eRecording to the portal. Down the road, the hope is that more counties would come on board with the project.

Discussion:

Senator May stated that he expressed his concern about title companies last month. He suggested to CI that Land Title is located on 1st Street in Cherry Creek, and they have the equipment installed.

Gregg Rippey stated that he met with Land Title yesterday, and he will continue to talk to them not only as beta but to determine why county adoption has been low. He added that the key to success is adoption, and it would be imprudent to move forward without deciding scope.

Senator May asked if Gregg Rippey had met with the association or the company.

Gregg Rippey clarified that he had met with the company, and he added that he is trying to get a meeting with the right folks over there. He wants to make sure it something that makes sense for adoption.

Michael Cooke added that Dianne Evans from Land Title serves on the eRecording Committee, and she is very involved. She stated that Dianne's office is very supportive, and her office is located in Douglas County.

Senator May asked if there had been any contact with banks or banking associations.

Gregg Rippey stated that he had not yet made any contacts, as this is just starting. However, he stated that he does know the key players in banking. He explained is just taking one challenge at a time, but he stated that the worst thing we could do is to throw something out there if key players haven't been involved.

B. Contracts Committee, Gregg Rippey

Gregg Rippey reported that SIPA is over budget with legal expenses. However, he stated that, over the last 30 days it has been evident that several agencies prefer to run EGE Agreement by legal counsel. He explained that there is certainly a vital role and position that legal is playing in this. As we move forward there will be fewer concerns, but we want to make sure we're doing it right from the beginning.

C. Finance Committee, Henry Sobanet

No report.

D. Personnel Committee, Rep. Cadman

No report.

IV. New Business

A. Executive Director Report, Gregg Rippy

Gregg Rippy stated that there were several action items from the last meeting that he was asked to report back about.

1. CI Resource Staffing

Gregg Rippy explained that CI planned to hire 12 full time employees by the end of this year in accordance with their response to the RFP. This is what projected revenue streams would allow. Currently CI has 13 employees, which is one more than originally planned. Since revenue is higher than expected, CI plans to hire four more employees by the end of this year, which will bring them to a total of 17 employees. Gregg Rippy added that CI hired a marketing project manager this quarter. He suggested that this might be a good time for Rich Olsen to introduce the new marketing project manager.

Rich Olsen introduced Jill Janicki who came from the Indiana portal. Rich Olsen stated that Ms. Janicki had been doing marketing for a year in Indiana before she came to Colorado.

Gregg Rippy stated that the key to this is that revenue is justifying additional employees. He added that a technical writer was recently hired, and CI is expecting to hire another project manager and two more developers. He stated that the good news is that resources are more robust so we can roll out more applications and services than originally anticipated.

2. Queue Management

Gregg Rippy explained that the queue is included in the GM Report, and Rich will talk more about it. Gregg Rippy explained that he wanted to discuss single sign on a little bit. He explained that single sign on was included in the original RFP, and CI brought forth a solution. He added that subsequently he has spoken with John Picanso and Mark Weatherford, and there is question as to whether or not the scope for single sign on is still appropriate. Therefore, Gregg Rippy asked CI to

look at the scope and determine if it is still appropriate. SIPA has set aside about \$750,000 for single sign on, and Gregg Rippy wants to make sure that we choose the appropriate solution. This will be discussed further next month.

3. Project Request Process

Gregg Rippy explained that in order for EGE's to put in a project request, an EGE Agreement must be signed. He added that over the last 30 days we have done well with executing these agreements. Once the EGE Agreement is signed, the EGE identifies a project for the portal undertaking. The EGE fills out a Project Request Form, which is reported and tracked by SIPA and Colorado.gov. Then the group reviews the request, and it is approved or sent back to the agency requesting more information. Part of the request form includes the agency scoring their agency resources and timeline urgency. After the request is approved, the prioritization process begins. Gregg Rippy added that a project isn't moving forward, it is most likely because the EGE Agreement is not complete.

Discussion:

Greg Jenik asked what the process is for getting the EGE out.

Gregg Rippy answered that as we are looking at some of the projects with the counties, an EGE would be acquired with county governments. He stated that a plan is being created as to how to get it out, and presenting to CGAIT in the near future would be a good vehicle for getting the word out. He added that the EGE Agreement is a template, and it shouldn't require much modification from EGE to EGE. The EGE Agreement simply says that SIPA and the EGE will work together.

Project Request Process (continued)

Gregg Rippy went on to explain project scoring. He added that the scoring team met last week and scored some projects. He explained that after scoring, a project moves to Tier 3. When Colorado.gov resources become available, the project with the highest score would move into Tier 2 for data gathering. Finally, the project would move to Tier 1 for active development. Gregg Rippy added that Colorado.gov hasn't reached a point yet where resources are not available to begin the projects. However, there are quite a lot of projects in the queue, and we want to make sure that everyone understands the approval process. We want the process to be transparent and fair.

He also added that, as requested by the Board, there are contact persons listed on each project. If there was to be an issue, we would know exactly who to contact.

Gregg Rippy showed the Project Request Form, and he explained that EGE's get to determine the importance of the project and resources available. The form gives guidelines as to how to self-assess with several questions an EGE can ask itself. Gregg Rippy added that the self-scoring accounts for 40 percent of the total score because EGE's play such a large role. Those numbers are then transferred to the matrix and the remainder of the scoring takes place.

Discussion:

Bob Feingold asked if the process was on the SIPA Website.

Angie Onorofskie stated that the process is on the Website. However, since the process has been refined the Website needs to be updated.

ACTION ITEM: Update SIPA Website to reflect refined project request process.

4. Upcoming Events

Spring Conference (CIMA, CFMA, CMA)

SIPA will be speaking at the Spring Conference (CIMA, CFMA and CMA) in Steamboat Springs, May 19. The presentation will give an update on portal activities since last year.

NIC National Partner Conference

CI will host the NIC National Partner Conference here in Denver next August. This will be a great opportunity to talk to portal managers from 17 other states to learn about best practices, what to avoid, etc.

Clerk and Recorders Association meeting

SIPA will be giving a presentation in Greeley on Friday, June 9 at 11 am. This is a chance to present eRecording to all the counties. Gregg Rippy added that this doesn't take away from what Douglas County is doing, but it gives us the opportunity to talk with Archuleta County, for example, and see what they think about eRecording. He added that the interesting thing is that there is only one state in the nation that is doing statewide eRecording, which is the state of Missouri. He added that SIPA would

monitor how they are doing and make sure that we have the correct approach.

Discussion:

Bob Feingold asked for a date for the NIC conference.

Rich Olsen reported that the date is August 12.

5. Agency Collaboration

Gregg Rippy stated that he feels one of his biggest roles as the executive director is to collaborate and communicate. He stated that he met with Mark Weatherford and John Picanso to make sure that SIPA was not doing anything to step on anybody's toes. Gregg Rippy stated that he serves on the IMC representing the private sector, and he was asked if he would participate on decision items before they go the IMC. He would request that this be taken into consideration and that the Board later in the meeting take formal action.

6. Credit Card Transaction/ Convenience Fees

Gregg Rippy stated that a number of agencies are coming forward with a couple of criteria. First, credit card fees have to be statutory neutral. Gregg Rippy stated that as we implement convenience the State Controller has some specific criteria. First, citizens must be fully aware that if they complete a transaction online, there is a fee associated. Citizens must also be aware that they can still complete transactions by some other means. This would be a large statement to the user so that the fee wouldn't surprise them. If the user feels it is convenient to pay the fees, then they can do so

Discussion:

Tambor Williams stated that she is licensing through vendors outside of the state, and she doesn't how her department could ask their customers to pay twice.

Gregg Rippy stated that those types of instances would be worked out in the work order.

Tambor Williams added that her department can't tell the customers that if they complete the transaction some other way that they wouldn't be charged a transaction fee

Senator May asked if there could be some timeframe for transition.

Gregg Rippy stated that this is a generality, and it might be different case by case. However, if using the master credit card agreement, we have to remain revenue neutral.

Gigi Dennis asked if there could be a sidebar meeting to talk about how this impacts departments and see what we could do.

Gregg Rippy stated that a sidebar meeting would be a good idea, and he added that the guts of this would come out in each individual work order.

Rich Olsen stated that he didn't want this to be a confusing point. He stated that, for example, if DORA were licensing through other vendors, then this would not affect them unless DORA decided to utilize the SIPA payment engine. It wouldn't affect something that DORA is already doing unless they choose to migrate to the portal.

Tambor Williams stated that at some point everyone should migrate to the portal.

Gregg Rippy stated that there are some work orders that are asking for a fee. Each agency would deal with these issues, as they are appropriate to the agency. However, Gregg Rippy stated that his reason for bringing this up was that he didn't want the Board to be surprised if they see a fee that they didn't know they negotiated. He added that the 2.5 percent fee is an average; some credit card fees will be higher and some will be lower.

Senator May stated that Cyber Security passed, and some of the issues pertain to credit cards. The bill says that the state will develop a cyber security plan. He said that when the bad guys understand what we are doing, there would be a lot of fishing going on.

Gregg Rippy stated that it is a good point to talk about this as a benefit to the portal. CI is operating under Sarbanes Oxley, and they probably get more scrutiny related to credit cards than anyone. They are tested all the time, and they have been passing the tests. He added that CI is probably being tested more robustly than anyone, and when an agency uses the portal CI inherits the liability.

Michael Cooke went back to the earlier discussion, and clarified that there are two types of agencies including: an agency that is currently absorbing credit card fees (DORA) and an agency (DOR) that wants to pass the fee along to the customer.

Tina Montoya stated that the same fee is charged for all licensing.

Michael Cooke then clarified that if the service is moved to the portal, the fee charged for the license would be decreased and the credit card fee would be passed along to the customer because your agency (DORA) is currently absorbing the credit card fee.

Gregg Rippy stated that some of the fees presupposed the cost, and others didn't. If it did presuppose, it would reduce cash funds to the agency. The goal is to not harm agencies for using the portal. There is no policy; it is simply a work order by work order basis as to what is appropriate for each EGE.

Senator May stated that Government Technology is having a summit on June 22.

Gregg Rippy thanked Senator May and stated that he would add the event to his calendar.

Senator May stated that he has been playing on Colorado.gov. He stated that he has found some holes and some good parts. He added when you ask a question on Live Help it doesn't go to the librarians.

Brenda Bailey-Hainer from the Colorado State Library, clarified that from 8 am to 5 pm, Monday through Friday, CI is the answering staff for Live Help. If it is busy or if it is after hours, the questions are routed to the librarians.

Senator May stated that he waited about 15 minutes before he got an answer.

Gregg Rippy thanked Senator May for the user acceptance test. He added that he also tried it, and he received a response in less than three minutes and even got additional information.

Senator May stated that there are 100 legislators across the street, and we have a problem over there with those people. He stated that the legislators think that we are burning money all over the place. He added that he's not sure how we will overcome this, but we need to. We need them to know what is going on.

Gregg Rippy asked to respond in a couple of ways. First, he stated, as we ramp up marketing the portal, the legislators will be one of our most important entities. He stated that if anyone comes across a legislator with misconceptions about the portal, please give the person's name to Gregg Rippy. Gregg Rippy stated that he would visit each and every one of them. Between now and November, the portal will roll out several applications, and we will focus very hard on the press. He added that he has spoken with friends in the media, and at the appropriate time he will get a story out. He stated that we want to make sure our product is everything we want it to be before we involve the press.

Gregg Rippy stated that another idea might be to talk to the JBC before they review budgets. There is a fear that if the portal takes on projects, then agencies will lose budget money. Gregg Rippy stated that part of his job description is to interface with the JBC and explain what we are and what we are not. The portal shouldn't negatively impact agencies' budgets. Portal projects are outside of base budget items, and agencies probably wouldn't be able to complete the projects without the additional resources. This is for the constituents, and is not a partisan thing. Rather the portal is something that serves at the will and pleasure of the state of Colorado.

Senator May suggested CI or somebody should give an introduction when the new legislators come in, which usually happens in December. Then right after session begins next year, we can get in the old Supreme Court room and do a presentation for returning members.

Gregg Rippy stated that it is important that we do a quick inventory of what is online and we can say, here is what we had and here is what we have now because of the portal. It is too easy for people to say that we wouldn't be able to do something if we don't have something to show.

Jack Arrowsmith asked John Picanso to frame the wording for the action that Gregg Rippy has asked the Board to take.

John Picanso stated he just heard that we might have an issue on that because the drafts are delivered to the executive branch. It may not be a good idea to have another entity do that.

Gregg Rippy offered food for thought. He stated that as we look at SB149, it asks that all agencies communicate and collaborate with SIPA. If you were to include someone from SIPA to review requests, it might fulfill that expectation of SB149.

Senator May stated that it could be a conflict of interest.

Bob Feingold stated that he thinks it would be important for everyone to review what changes to the IMC have taken place out of SB149. He added the approval roles of the IMC are much less and the review roles are much more. Therefore, there might not be a conflict of interest from someone who is on the IMC (from the private sector) who is the executive director of SIPA.

Jack Arrowsmith asked if this decision could be delayed.

John Picanso agreed that more information needed to be gathered before making a decision.

Greg Jenik stated that he is thrilled that CI is adding staff and moving forward with delivering on the plans put forth to the Board. However, he asked if the reasons the additional people were adding so much speed is because they are coming from other portals. Gregg Jenik asked what guarantees are in place from NIC that employees will stay in Colorado for a while and will not be poached by the next portal that comes along.

Rich Olsen stated that this portal in particular has more people that have come from other states than any other portal has ever had. He stated that he could say with certainty that every person that has come to Colorado from another state portal has come because of an extenuating circumstance. He added that he would not jeopardize the Colorado portal by sending employees somewhere else unless there is somebody equal or better to replace them.

B. General Manager's Report, Rich Olsen

1. Project Report

Web Content Management System

Rich Olsen reported that April was an exceptional month. The content management system is functional. OIT, which is the first pilot site, is on the system. Rich Olsen added that since CI wants to test and make sure it goes well, CI is actually building the OIT page for them and then teaching them how to use and maintain the content management system. After the pilot is successful, CI will ask the departments to set up their own sites

with the content management. The content management system is very functional, and it is looking very good.

Google Search Engine

Rich Olsen stated that the Google search engine is one that hasn't been mentioned. He stated that this was part of the RFP as something that CI would bring, and it is currently being tested. CI has done a crawl on all the government Websites. CI is also working with Archives, which uses the Varsity tool. Once complete, the tool will be offered to agencies for specific site searches, and it won't cost them anything. The search engine is in final testing, and it should be up within the next couple of weeks.

COFRS and Payment Engine

COFRS and Payment Engine are in final testing, and all tests look good so far. By the end of May, we should be able to take a transaction all the way through the process from start to finish. This will be a great landmark.

Discussion:

Senator May asked if the payment engine would actually drop the money that is due to each department.

Rich Olsen answered yes. He explained that the statutory fee goes from the SIPA account to the Treasury account. When the transfer happens, the COFRS transaction goes through and matches transactions.

Greg Jenik asked if the matching takes place after the transaction.

Rich Olsen answered yes. He explained that the receivable is matched and then the actual transfer is also matched.

Great Colorado Payback

Rich Olsen stated that Great Colorado Payback online submission service was to be completed by April, but now it will be done in May. This project is exciting for a couple of reasons. First, it will alleviate work from the Treasurer's Office. Second, it cuts work down for the claimant by two weeks. This is the first application that will be marketed. Live Help and There Ought to Be a Law had associated press releases, but this is the first service to make a big splash.

Discussion:

Senator May asked where is data stored.

Rich Olsen answered that the data belongs to the Treasurer, and it is dumped nightly to CI.

Senator May asked if it was a mainframe or network.

Rich Olsen replied that it is a mainframe.

Great Colorado Payback (continued)

Rich Olsen reported that as a part of the rollout of the Great Colorado Payback online submission service, CI has been working very closely with Brian Anderson at Treasury and Dan Hopkins in the Governor's Office to coordinate a marketing plan. The plan is to do a large press event for Treasury and the Governor's Office surrounding the launch of the Unclaimed Property service. They are currently looking for an appropriate date.

Rich Olsen explained the draft- marketing plan that was handed out to the Board. He stated that the target market for this service is everyone. The three key messages are on page four, and he invited the Board to read them at their leisure. Basically, the messages are that the Colorado State Treasurer is trying to return unclaimed property to its rightful owners. Secondly, Governor Owens is ensuring that Colorado government provides the most efficient and effective way to provide services to Coloradoans. Finally, the state of Colorado is taking positive steps toward making Colorado government more accessible to citizens and businesses.

Rich Olsen explained that page five outlines the marketing tactics, which start now and are ongoing. It explains what we are doing now, and what will be done online. He stated that it would be neat to see how the press event goes.

Discussion:

Senator May asked if one event could be planned for the Digital Government Summit.

Rich Olsen stated that CI might have something by then. He added that it would be helpful for Colorado.gov to have a booth at the event.

Senator May suggested joining forces with AeA.

Greg Jenik stated that he would bring up the idea at the AeA meeting next week.

Greg Jenik asked what the likelihood was to get television press for this service.

Rich Olsen explained that two drop ins would take place, one in Grand Junction and the other in Colorado Springs.

Great Colorado Payback (continued)

Rich Olsen continued to explain that part of the marketing plan includes measuring success, which can be done in a number of ways. Some examples include call volume, adoption rate, and fulfillment time.

Discussion:

Gregg Rippy asked the Board their opinion on success metrics. He stated that he thought it was very important to baseline and see where we add value.

Bob Feingold stated that success metrics are a best practice.

Greg Jenik stated that it is a little bit difficult to know the validity of a baseline on something like this.

Rich Olsen agreed, as it is so general. Rich Olsen stated that when there is a department that has a very defined user group, it is a lot easier to track this. He added that many departments don't track a lot of metrics, which is something that CI struggles with.

Greg Jenik added that another metric is ROI, but he stated that it would be difficult to measure in this case.

Senator May asked if Colorado.gov would be strapped to Google or if we could be flexible if something else comes along.

Rich Olsen stated that Colorado.gov was not completely tied in, but there is a two-year contract in place. If something else comes along we could use something else. Half of the NIC states don't use Google.

Senator May stated that at one point there were three search engines within the state. He added that he would assume those are compatible with what we are doing anyway.

Mark Church stated that it is possible to add content from other search engine to the Google search engine.

Senator May stated that it sure would help the legislators.

Interactive Driving Record Delivery

Rich Olsen explained that this service was slated to go live in May, but resources had to be moved to another project due to an emergency.

2. Project Queue

Rich Olsen asked that the Board to look at the queue and see what they thought about it in general. He stated that now that it has been revised, it is much easier to see exactly where a project is and how it got there. Rich Olsen explained the tier system:

- ◆ Tier 3 – EGE and project request are complete
- ◆ Tier 2 – Work Order is complete and data gathering is occurring.
- ◆ Tier 1- Active development

Rich Olsen stated that the project request/queue management process is very structure. It is easy to track applications through the new process. He added that there has been a lot of confusion in the past, but this should really help.

Discussion:

Senator May stated that at the IMC, commissioners get a dashboard with red, yellow, or green. He suggested that if there was a similar convention here, the Board would know if anything slipped.

Rich Olsen stated that it is usually color-coded, but it just hasn't been added to this format. He assured Senator May that it would be added.

Senator May stated that it should be standard that if something is in the red for five months the Board would get concerned about it.

Gregg Rippey stated that the dashboard is very appropriate when discussing large applications. However, he stated, the applications here would never get into the red. He added that as we talk about things like eRecording and others, it might be appropriate to have a project readout just like the IMC that tells the full status of what is going on.

Senator May stated that everything would be guarded between now and the elections.

Greg Jenik stated that the dashboard creates a metric too, especially if most things are green. It's a wonderful baseline.

Rich Olsen stated that there is a separate Website project queue, which describes requests to add EGE's to content management.

3. Portal Metrics

Rich Olsen stated that accesses to Colorado.gov were 2.6 million April. He explained that this would bounce around until some large applications are added. He stated that he is hoping that the Great Colorado Payback boosts accesses.

Discussion:

Jack Arrowsmith asked if these were unique hits.

Rich Olsen stated that they were unique hits.

4. Financial Report

Rich Olsen reported that revenues were strong at 178,506 dollars for the month of March. Revenues year-to-date are 542,708 dollars.

5. Possible Future Applications and Websites

Rich Olsen explained that due to the revision of the request process, a new section (Possible Future Applications and Websites) has been added to the GM Report. These are projects that may be considered sometime in the future, but they have not yet completed paperwork such as the EGE Agreement or Project Request Form. The plan is to go back to these EGE's so that they can progress. Some of the EGE's are more interested than others, but they are going back to all of those on the original list to see if they are still interested.

6. Project Costs

Rich Olsen explained that the project costs so far are over \$90,000. This is never charged to the state, but it shows the value that the state is receiving.

Discussion:

Senator May stated that there was a big boost for accesses to Colorado.gov. He asked if this could be attributed to anything that we have done.

Rich Olsen stated that it couldn't really be attributed to anything we have done because nothing we have done so far would have caused much of a spike. It could be attributed to tax season, the legislative session, etc.

Gregg Rippy stated that if you look April 2005, accesses were actually slightly down.

Gigi Dennis stated that there was a press release for Live Help, and maybe that could have triggered some more accesses.

C. SIPA Security Standards and Measures, Mark Church

Security standards Colorado Interactive is held to (externally and internally)

- Sarbanes- Oxley – financial standards
- Payment Card Industry Data Security Standards
- State Security Standards
- Internal NIC Policies
- Lessons learned from other states

Discussion:

Senator May asked how much of the state security standards CI had.

Mark Church stated that CI was given the standards from OIT.

Senator May asked if CI had met with Mark Weatherford.

Mark Church answered that CI has met with Mark Weatherford many times, and they continue to be in close consultation with him. He added that CI is in a good position to make sure they fulfill the external requirements.

Gregg Rippy added that there have been communications with Mark Weatherford and his contractors. They certainly want to help with more than just vulnerability. SIPA is willing to work with Mark Weatherford's team as a beta, but we certainly don't want to be the leaders in their initiative. It is being scoped currently.

Senator May stated that Higher Ed is out of trouble for now, but a security plan will be developed through CCHE.

Gregg Rippy added that the only identity theft the state has had was through Higher Ed.

Senator May added that if we deliver data through our portal to the public we will be concerned about what goes to the campuses.

Gregg Rippy reiterated that the portal is working closely with Mark Weatherford.

Mark Church also added that the procedures require encrypted hard drives.

Firewall

- Deep Inspection (unusual traffic)
- Intrusion Detection and Prevention – looks at existing vulnerability in Internet infrastructure, drop packets. Some of this has been detected from the state networks, but it has been fixed.

Mark Church stated that the first line of defense is the firewall, which prevents traffic from the outside world.

Encryption

- 1024 Bit RSA
- 512 Bit AES

Authentication

- Multiple Authentication Domains
 - Management
 - ◆ Two factor authentication (certificate and password)
 - Customer
 - ◆ Basic authentication over SSL (prevents any of the accounts from further attacks)

Mark Church explained that none of the accounts are shared. When testing, it is done as a customer account. Management is completely separate, which gives protection from the disclosure of the customer accounts.

Account Management

- All customer information is validated against two separate sources
- Callbacks are utilized to distribute account activation codes
- Account activity and access reviewed quarterly – this assures that all accounts have appropriate access.
- Full suite of self - service account management tools

Mark Church explained that it must be kept in perspective who is using the accounts. Many problems can occur if the users are unknown.

Security Hardening

- Datacenter
 - Jumpstart to Solaris Security

Mark Church explained that these allow for following industry best practices.

- Development
 - Laptop home directories are encrypted
 - Screensaver passwords required – automatic login not allowed
 - User accounts are not granted administrator privileges
 -

Mark Church stated that if a laptop was compromised or stolen, the data could not be accessed.

Discussion:

Greg Jenik asked if the laptops were backed up.

Mark Church stated that the laptops are backed up weekly on a central server.

Patch Management

- Vendor supplied packages are used whenever practical
- All other 3rd party packages are compiled from source
- Automated patch management is used on production and development systems

Mark Church stated that this allows quick response if a vulnerability is detected.

Discussion:

Senator May asked Bob Feingold if the results from the test in 2000 could be given to Mark Church so he knows where it's coming from.

Bob Feingold stated that DPA could give it to Mark Church if they wanted to, although that test was done on the networks.

Senator May asked Mark Church if that would be helpful.

Mark Church stated that he wasn't sure.

Arlene Booker stated that Coalfire might be more applicable.

Senator May stated that he was concerned about the laptops in the legislature, as they have a lot of people getting their hands on them.

Mark Church stated that separate authentication domains help that problem.

Senator May suggested that Mark Church speak to Michael Adams about the laptops, as he is the legislative support.

Mark Church stated that he wouldn't expect that the legislators would need to get in the laptops at a management level.

Architecture

- N-Tier network and application design – prevents intrusions from becoming larger.
- Development environment physically separate from test and production
- Site- to- site VPNs prohibited

Mark Church explained that this prevents intrusions from becoming larger than they need to be. He added that this is a key architectural feature that CI uses. He explained that a machine that performs one task only gets authorized for that task.

If someone penetrates perimeter, there are still several levels, which makes the hacker's job a lot more difficult.

Vulnerability scanning

- When applications are released
 - Watchfire AppScan – look at application vulnerabilities (happens in test environment)
- Quarterly reviews
 - Security metrics

Mark Church explained that PCI (one of the five companies that Visa and MasterCard have authorized to do tests) has done two scans on CI, which have both gone very well.

- Yearly reviews
 - Firewall rules – third party reviews and provides feedback.
 - Password rules – verify that passwords are as secure as they need to be.

Discussion:

Greg Jenik asked if the passwords were constant or evolving.

Mark Church stated that the passwords have to be changed every six weeks.

V. Additional Discussion

Mike Monkman from OSPB stated that he didn't want to put a damper on John Picanso's suggestion earlier to have the portal look at IT decision items. He stated that the current process is a practice of the current administration and has been since 1999. The prior administration had a more open process as to what would be decision items. He explained that it just so happens that this administration has a more closed and deliberative process before the budget is submitted in November. It doesn't mean that something might not happen to allow something different. Mike Monkman stated that he would discuss the issue with Henry Sobanet.

Bob Feingold stated that the IMC used to see decision items after they were coordinated with the OSPB. The IMC would then review those and provide a set of recommendations to the JBC and Capitol Development Committee, based on all members of the IMC seeing it. Bob Feingold explained that the governor has appointed Gregg Rippey to serve as a member of the IMC, knowing his past and current position. Bob Feingold explained that under the old rules it would be okay, but we would have to take a look at it now that Senate Bill 149 has passed and how those have changed. The budget process is more collaborative.

Mike Monkman added the OSPB reviews items.

Gregg Rippy stated that it is not essential for a vote unless it changes decision items. He stated that where there might be value is keeping everyone in the loop by knowing what agencies are doing. John Picanso's thought (although Gregg Rippy stated he was not speaking for him) was that the sooner he knows the better. The idea was certainly not to take anything away from the Governor's Office.

Mike Monkman stated that OSPB puts a lot of scrutiny on applications to determine if they might be a fit for the portal. In fact, he stated, some requests get nixed because the refuse to talk to the portal.

Bob Feingold stated that OSBP and OIT would probably take the opportunity with the passage of Senate Bill 149 to review the procedures and see where to collaborate.

Mike Monkman stated that the portal just adds a new dimension.

Jack Arrowsmith stated that the issue has been tabled, and it will be reviewed.

Gregg Rippy stated that he had two matters of old business. First, the RFP required that source code be escrowed. CI has started to escrow source code into a safety deposit box over which SIPA has control. We will begin to escrow so that we have more than object code. The second item is that SIPA has been determined as a local government by the State Auditor. This may change how we must audit and the timing of audits.

Greg Jenik stated that his seat as a Board member was to come up for re-election. He explained that through discussions with Chairman Cadman, his (Greg Jenik's) appointment was taken in front of the governor for an extension. Greg Jenik reported that he got a call from Bard Card last week, and he has been re-appointed.

Jack Arrowsmith welcomed Greg Jenik as a re-appointed member for the next two years.

VI. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

None specific.

Next meeting is scheduled for:

Thursday, June 1, 2006

1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Legislative Services Building

200 E. 14th Ave.

Audit Hearing Room, 1st Floor

Denver, CO

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:27 p.m.